Twitter User Classification using Ambient Metadata

Chirag Nagpal
Dept. of Computer Engineering
Army Institute of Technology
Pune, India
chiragnagpal_12102@aitpune.edu.in

Khushboo Singhal
Supercomputer Education & Research Center
Indian Institute of Science
Bangalore, India
khushboo_singhal@daiict.ac.in

arXiv:1407.8499v1 [cs.SI] 31 Jul 2014

ABSTRACT

Microblogging websites, especially Twitter have become an important means of communication, in todays time. Often these services have been found to be faster than conventional news services. With millions of users, a need was felt to classify users based on ambient metadata associated with their user accounts. We particularly look at the effectiveness of the 'profile description' field in order to carry out the task of user classification. Our results show that such metadata can be an effective feature for any classification task.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

I.2 [**Artificial Intelligence**]: Miscellaneous

General Terms

Verification

Keywords

Twitter, Classification, Machine Learning

1. INTRODUCTION

Twitter, over the years has gained immense popularity with milllions of registered users. As a microblogging website, Twitter allows users to post terse 140 character long 'tweets' or status updates. For any information retrieval or reccommendation task, user classification can be an effective pre-processing step. Previous work [5] have utilised profile features and some tweets of a user to bring about the task of user classification, in our study we do **not** consider the tweets of a user, but utilise other features like followers count, following count, number of tweets and the profile description of a user. The profile description is a short 160 character alphanumeric field. To the best of our knowledge no previous attempt at user classification has utilised this feature. We train two classifiers, OUC, to classify profiles as Organisations, Users and Others and MPS, to classify users on the basis of interest towards Music, Politics and Sports. In order to train the classifier we utilise Decision Trees, Naive Bayes and Support Vector Machines. Comparative results are provided in Section 3.

2. FEATURE SET

Any classifier, requires a set of features to be trained upon, for our classifier, as mentioned earlier, we utilise a) The followers count, b) The following count, c) The number of Tweets, d) Ratio of Followers to Following count and the e) Profile Description. Features a,b,c are whole numbers whereas the Profile Description is a 160 character alphanumeric field.

Profile Description

We analysed a corpus of over 70,000 user profiles, which were aggregated using the Twitter Streaming API [1] and found that about 85% provide atleast one or more character of user description. We removed all punctuation marks and special characters from all the descriptions. Out of the users that do provide profile description , the average length was found to be 59 characters while the average number of words was approximately 6.



Figure 1: No. of users vs. no. of words

We analysed our corpus of user profiles and extracted the top 50 most frequently occuring words in the profile description. These words were used for creating binary features to train our algorithms.

Numerical Features

Since, the range of values for the numerical features was large, binning was required to reduce dimensionality of our

features. This was carried out using the function

$$H(n) = [\log_{10} n] \quad (1)$$

Here n is the whole number value associated with the particular feature and [ ] is the greatest integer function. Figures 2 to 5 visualise the Features after binning using the function described above.

We also define another derived feature, 'ratio' which is essentially the ratio of the followers count and the following count. Since this produces a fractional term, to this we apply the function as described above to perform binning.

3. TRAINING & RESULTS

We trained to classifiers, OUC to classify users as Organisations, Users and Celebrites and MPC, Music, Politics and Sports. We aggregated 1200 user profiles and labelled them as OUC and MPS. For each classification we trained Decision Trees (DT), Naive Bayes (NB) and Linear Support Vector Machines (SVM). For DT & NB we utilise the NLTK Python package [2], while for SVM we utilise SciKit [4].

For each classification we perform 4-cross validation, and present the most accurate confusion matrix out of the four iterations. We also provide the average accuracy of the entire classifier.

3.1 OUC Classifier

3.1.1 Decision Trees

	U	O	C
U	**36.8**%	1.9%	0.9%
O	7.5%	**16.0%**	15.1%
C	0.9%	1.9%	**18.9%**

Accuracy: 71.7%

Table 1: Confusion Matrix for DT in OUC

3.1.2 Support Vector Machines

	U	O	C
U	**36.8**%	2.8%	.
O	7.5%	**17.9%**	13.2%
C	0.9%	.	**20.8%**

Accuracy: 75.5%

Table 2: Confusion Matrix for SVM in OUC

3.1.3 Naive Bayes

	U	O	C
U	**37.1**%	.	1.9%
O	1.9%	**22.9%**	4.8%
C	1.9%	2.9%	**27.6%**

Accuracy: 87.6%

Table 3: Confusion Matrix for NB in OUC



Figure 2: No. of Users vs Followers Count



Figure 3: No. of Users vs Followings Count



Figure 4: No. of Users vs Tweets Count



Figure 5: No. of Users vs Ratio

	Feature	Label	Ratio
1	followers = 6	c : u	34.1 : 1.0
2	ratio = 4	c : u	26.9 : 1.0
3	ratio = 3	c : u	15.6 : 1.0
4	contains(my)	u : o	14.1 : 1.0
5	followers = 4	u : c	13.6 : 1.0
6	contains(news)	o : u	13.1 : 1.0
7	contains(official)	o : u	13.0 : 1.0
8	contains(from)	o : c	11.2 : 1.0
9	contains(i)	u : o	9.9 : 1.0
10	followers = 3	u : o	8.7 : 1.0

Table 4: Most Significant Features in Naive Bayes

Features	DT	SVM	NB
numerical	65.6%	66.7%	64.8%
numerical+ratio	64.6%	65.6%	66.3%
numrical+ratio+description	69.6%	72.9%	80.9%

Table 5: Average Results for OUC classification

3.2 MPS Classifier

3.2.1 Decision Trees

	M	P	S
M	**30.9%**	1.4%	2.2%
P	2.9%	**32.5%**	4.1%
S	3.8%	2.2%	**20.1%**

Accuracy: 83.4%

Table 6: Confusion Matrix for DT in MPS

3.2.2 Naive Bayes

	M	P	S
M	**23.8%**	2.9%	7.6%
P	4.8%	**29.5%**	3.8%
S	10.5%	5.7%	**11.4%**

Accuracy: 76.8%

Table 7: Confusion Matrix for NB in MPS

4. CONCLUSIONS

We find that ambient profile metadata associated with user profiles, is an efficient feature set to bring about user classification. For both classifiers, MPS and OUC we get reasonably high accuracies after 4 cross validation. As expected, from Table 4 we can infer that the OUC classifier depends more on numerical features like followers count whereas, from Table 5 it is clear that the MPS classifier relies more on the lexical features of the profile description. We can thus conclude that any future twitter classifier, must incorporate these features, in its training.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Prof. N Balakrishnan for constant guidance and support. We would also like to thank the Supercomputer Education Research Centre, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore and the Indian Academy of Sciences, The National Academy of Sciences, India and the Indian National Science Academy for providing the opportunity to carry out the research work.

	Feature	Label	Ratio
1	contains(music)	m : p	23.4 : 1.0
2	contains(sports)	s : p	10.6 : 1.0
3	contains(news)	p : m	9.4 : 1.0
4	contains(breaking)	p : s	8.6 : 1.0
5	contains(new)	m : p	8.3 : 1.0
6	contains(it)	m : p	6.7 : 1.0
7	contains(father)	s : p	6.2 : 1.0
8	contains(singer)	m : p	5.9 : 1.0
9	contains(india)	m : p	5.9 : 1.0
10	contains(by)	p : m	5.3 : 1.0

Table 8: Most Significant Features in Naive Bayes

Features	DT	SVM	NB
numerical	50.5%	*	42.1%
numerical+ratio	53.4%	*	43.1%
numrical+ratio+description	80.1%	*	65.3%

Table 9: Average Results for MSP classification

6. REFERENCES

[1] Twitter Developer API. `http://dev.twitter.com/`.

[2] S. Bird, E. Klein, and E. Loper. *Natural Language Processing with Python*. O'Reilly Media, Inc., 1st edition, 2009.

[3] C. D. Manning, P. Raghavan, and H. Schütze. *Introduction to Information Retrieval*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2008.

[4] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python . *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.

[5] M. Pennacchiotti and A.-M. Popescu. A machine learning approach to twitter user classification. In L. A. Adamic, R. A. Baeza-Yates, and S. Counts, editors, *ICWSM*. The AAAI Press, 2011.

[6] D. Ramage, S. T. Dumais, and D. J. Liebling. Characterizing microblogs with topic models. In W. W. Cohen and S. Gosling, editors, *ICWSM*. The AAAI Press.

[7] A. Ritter, S. Clark, Mausam, and O. Etzioni. Named entity recognition in tweets: An experimental study. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, EMNLP '11, pages 1524–1534, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[8] W. X. Zhao, J. Jiang, J. He, Y. Song, P. Achananuparp, E.-P. Lim, and X. Li. Topical keyphrase extraction from twitter. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies - Volume 1*, HLT '11, pages 379–388, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics.